

Verbatim Minutes
GIANT MINE REMEDIATION PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT
SEMI ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PARTIES
May 17, 2021
Via Zoom Conference Call

IN ATTENDANCE:

Giant Mine Oversight Board

David Livingstone – Chair
Kathy Racher - Director
Ken Froese – Director
Ken Hall – Director
Tony Brown – Director
Mark Palmer - Director
Ben Nind – Executive Director
Paul Green – GMOB Contractor

North Slave Métis Alliance

Jessica Hurtubise

Yellowknives Dene First Nation

William Lines

City of Yellowknife

Kerry Penney
Todd Slack (contractor)

Government of Canada (CIRNAC)

Chris MacInnis
Natalie Plato
Geneva Irwin
Katherine Ross
Jessica Mace
Andrei Torianski

Government of the Northwest Territories

Diep Duong
Alex Lynch
Jeff Rosnawski

Alternatives North

Gord Hamre
Michael Nabert
Katharine Thomas

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021

Welcome & Approval of Agenda

David: Welcome everyone for our semi-annual meeting. For some reason I assumed that we were going to meet in person, but I guess with this COVID outbreak and all that stuff, it's not wise to do that just yet. Hopefully at the next meeting, we can once again meet in person. It will be a novel event. Just so you know, we have had difficulty at times with the Internet in the office, so if the Zoom link drops out, rest assured, we will restore it as quickly as possible. I guess we will all have to call back in, though. It will probably take, based on the last time this happened, 10 minutes or so to reestablish it.

That is it for me. It's nice to see everyone. It's a nice day outside...maybe spring. Maybe spring? They are capturing geese in the Delta right now, so that's good. I saw a huge flock of snow geese the other day. There must have been a thousand in the flock. Maybe spring is finally getting a toehold here.

The first thing on the agenda beyond the welcome is approval of the agenda. Does anyone have any changes or alterations in the agenda? Any alterations?

(Pause)

I'm not seeing anybody, so can I get somebody then to move approval of the agenda? Don't be shy.

Todd: I'll move it.

Gord: I'll second it then.

David: Everybody in favor?

Approval of the Minutes from Previous Meeting

David: The next item is the approval of the minutes from the Semi-Annual Meeting of December 16, 2020. Are there any suggestions for changes on that? It has been circulated, and people have had time to comment on it.

Alright, if there are not any changes, then can I get somebody to move approval of those minutes?

Kathy: I'll move to approve the minutes.

Michael: I'll second that.

David: All in favor?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Review of Action Items

- David: Good. Review of the action items is next. Ben, do you want to lead us through that?
- Ben: Yes, so there were three action items that came out from last year. The first one was Alternatives North's comment regarding punctuations concerns for transcript of the Semi-Annual Meeting of 2020-08-27. That came from Gordon. So, Gordon, I didn't receive anything. Are you okay with the minutes as they stand then?
- Gordon: I'm okay with the minutes as they stand.
- Ben: Okay. Thank you. Action Item 2 is GMOB ED is to include Jessica Mace on the invite list. I have done that, and I just received a request from Natalie to also include Katherine Ross. So, Katherine, you are now on the invitation list for all our meetings.
- Action Item 3 noted that leads of initiatives related to the Project are invited to report progress in any semi-annual meeting. That has been noted. Anytime the Project or anybody else wants to invite a lead from outside the Project Team, they are more than invited to come. Those are the three action items.
- David: Alright, are there any additional comments on those?

Update on the Five-Year Review of the Environmental Agreement

- David: Okay, next is the five-year review of the Environmental Agreement. As you all know, we had that five-year review from the group that did it.
- Ben: Arktis.
- David: Arktis. We received the final report. Some of our responses are included in our annual report, which will be out I guess in the next couple of weeks. Ben, is there anything outstanding on that?
- Ben: No.
- David: Okay. Basically, we accepted all of the recommendations in one way or another. The library, we are working on that. The communication strategy or whatever else was on that list...I don't recall. Oh, here we go. Thanks.

I am not going to go through all the recommendations, but we essentially agreed to all of them. The dashboard is built into our next report, our upcoming report, I should say. I do not think there was any equivocation. We were happy with the report. It did

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021

point out a number of areas that we should focus on to improve, but other than that, it was a good exercise, I think. I don't know, did anybody else of the Parties have any comments on that report? Todd?

Todd: We have one major issue with it and a couple of minor details. The major one was Recommendation 7 in Section 593, if I am remembering that reference right. I think it is important to get this on the record, because in 10 years when the next review goes forward, they are going to look at that last one and be like, "Oh, okay, well here is where we start."

The big issue here is that GMOB itself is not intended to address all legacy issues. That's the top line recommendation here. GMOB has a particular scope early on, and the big issue here is the roles and responsibilities this recommendation seeks to put on the Parties. That's number-one why the City is interested here, why the City is concerned.

It is why discussing this is really important, because there is some stuff in there that is real troublesome. Really, there is a section in the Agreement, it's 10.3. It's called "Roles of the Parties." That is the heading, and it notes that but then immediately proceeds to discard that. It says that it is surprisingly the other Parties – there is GMOB, there are the proponents, and then there are the other Parties – that the other Parties' role is defined by a "may". Not only am I a little bit shocked that they just discarded this, but you know, for those of us who were involved in this thing, we hemmed and hawed. Well, we did not hem and haw, we debated what the appropriate language was all through this. So, the word, that permissive qualifier, "may," as to what the Parties are going to do is not a surprise, it is intentional. To allege anything else is completely wrong.

Further in that section, it goes on to assert that the other Parties have a responsibility in delivering the measures. That's wrong as well. The measures are directed at people, and when you read the Agreement, you have to read it with - and I don't think that they did - I think they picked and chose specific clauses that supported it, and they tried to draw connections between them. They would read the clause without reading the top level above it, if we are talking about the measures bit.

In the Purposes, it is the Agreement that is designed to provide – that's the framework to help deliver on the Measures. You cannot then proceed to assert or infer that there is some delegated authority or responsibility that goes further to the Parties. That's wrong. That, in particular, I think needs a second read.

I will just say one more thing. The other clauses that it relies on, is it 2.1.C and 10.2.A number 3. You can't read those without reading Part A. You can't define a new collaborative role with GMOB overseeing a grand work plan without understanding that it has already been considered. You have to read Section A that it is the

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021

Agreement that is going to achieve these things. We don't need additional work or additional steps.

It feels like this is another section of, "Hey, this would be a nice to have where we all are on the very same page," but we have three levels of government here, two independent First Nations governments, and an NGO. We do different things. There isn't going to be an overarching work plan. I think that the recommendation and the section in the Agreement needs a review and needs reconsideration in light of the roles and responsibilities of GMOB. It's not that GMOB can't consider things that are outside of its direct responsibility, but those things have to have impact into the human health and environment of the remediation project.

There is a lot of discretion, but it is not undoubted. GMOB is not the home for everything. This is my last day. Well, actually Friday was my last day, so I don't know what Kerry is going to do with this, but that is the sentiment. Thanks.

David: I will turn to other folks before I respond. Does anybody else have any comments on Todd's concerns?

(Pause)

I'm not seeing any. I guess my reading of that recommendation was not quite as all-encompassing as you are suggesting. I read it as everybody should collaborate and maybe figure out a way to collaborate more effectively. The notion of developing a coordinated overall strategy line, I'm not sure about that. It says 'could' include.

We will follow-up with Gary, I guess, and see what the City would like to do in terms of making its concerns a little more explicit. Maybe a letter from the City would be helpful, but we certainly have your comments on the record now, so that may be sufficient for the time being. I noticed somebody on the chat there.

Todd: The chat was Kerry stepping away. She's like, "Oh boy. He's getting me into shit, and then he's going to leave, and I will have to deal with it."

David: Anyhow, I take your comments seriously. Does anybody else have any comments on that five-year report?

(Pause)

Ok, not hearing any, I guess we will move on to the next agenda item.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Status of the GMOB Annual Report

- David: The status of the GMOB Annual Report: As I said, we are just about done with it. It is going to go to the printer in the next day or two. Ben or Kathy, you were the leads on it. Do you want to provide any other updates? Folks have seen the draft.
- Kathy: No, I think Ben has been in charge of getting it all done. I will say, we did try to do a little bit of a different approach this time. We tried to actually listen to the comments that were in the five-year review about communication. Anyway, we will see what the public thinks of it. I just want to say thanks to everyone for taking a look at it in advance for factual errors. I appreciated that. Do you have anything to add, Ben?
- Ben: No, I'm good. It will go to the printer probably in two days, and then we can expect it out in ten days' time. Then we will be arranging for both the distribution of it and some public feedback. Then we will be arranging the annual public meeting, which will be through Cabin Radio once more.
- Kathy: Does anyone have any comments or questions on the Annual Report?
- Natalie: I guess Ben almost answered my question about the public meeting. Do you have a date set for that?
- Ben: No, not yet, but we are expecting probably mid to late June.
- Natalie: Mid to late June, okay. Thank you.
- Ben: I will definitely keep everybody apprised of what that schedule looks like. It will depend on the distribution and how long we want it to be in the public before we have that public meeting. Thank you.
- David: Okay, are there any other questions, comments, or observations?
- Alex: I'm just wondering, can we ask specific questions about some of the content in the draft plan? I had a question when we did the fact checking, and I just wanted to get clarification on one piece if that's fine at this stage.
- David: Sure.
- Alex: I'm just trying to find the exact section to reference, but there was mention of GMOB conducting a survey regarding land use, future land use. I was just curious if GMOB could provide a little bit more information on what their thinking is around that. As you are well aware, our Minister sent a response letter to GMOB on the land use planning process. We are in the process of setting up a meeting with our ADMs with Lands, ENR, and MACA with the City of Yellowknife to discuss roles and responsibilities for future land use planning for Giant. I was just curious to know what

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

the plan was for that and how those considerations would be incorporated into this type of survey.

David: That is a good question. Events are catching up the Annual Report, I think. It would probably be wise for us to wait until there is some more movement between the City and the GNWT on responsibility for land use planning before we launch the survey. I think the survey was more intended to get people's views, the broader public's views on what the site should look like, not so much who was responsible for making that happen, although that would certainly come up in the course of the discussions.

The future of the site has been discussed at length within the Project and at the Land and Water Board hearing and so on, but I'm not sure that the broader public in Yellowknife and the communities, aside from Ndilo and Dettah has really had an opportunity to weigh in, in a semi-formal orchestrated, coordinated way. That was the intent, not to point fingers but to get a better sense of what the general public might like to see out there over time. Kathy, Ben, do you have anything to add to that?

Kathy: Maybe I'll also point out that the survey was not going to be just about land uses. We were just trying to think...we continue to be concerned that your average Joe does not know what the risks are going to be at the site and long-term. We just wanted to sort of gauge what people knew and how much they knew. Part of that is engaging the effectiveness of engagement with the public, the public at large. The land use isn't the focus, it is part of what would come out of that.

Alex, we have not done any planning on exactly what is going to be in that survey yet. We will be doing that in the next few months. We won't just go out with it without checking in with you certainly. Like David says, there is definitely no intention to ask the public who they think is responsible or anything like that. That's not what this is about.

Alex: Okay, perfect. Thanks a lot. I appreciate that. I guess it was just knowing in advance kind of what the plan was for that, also noting that we are here to support and take a peek at that survey once you have it developed. As you mentioned, it is broader than just land use, so I think the Project Team generally would be happy to take a peek at that survey as well to provide input if suitable.

I guess I will flag the Project as well in developing a constraints map for post-closure that would look at the land use constraints at the site. We are hoping to have that in the fall sometime. I think that will really inform discussions around future use of the site. I'm just flagging that is coming as well.

Kathy: Okay, that will be helpful.

David: Yeah, that would be really helpful. The short answer to your question to what is the plan, right now there is no plan other than a general...

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Kathy: A plan to make a plan. We have a plan to make a plan.

David: We will be making a plan, and we are also committed to working with you guys to make sure whatever survey goes out is effective for all of us. Alright, are there any other comments or questions about the Annual Report? Natalie?

Natalie: Yeah, David, thank you. Similarly, there was mention about a socio-ec review. I'm wondering if you have any details on that or if it is just a plan to plan. Again, another one of those. We are very interested to hear about that.

David: Actually, we are going to talk about that a little later, but we are not there now though.

Natalie: Oh, okay.

David: We did ask a couple of consultants, Louise Matthews, David Stewart, and Andy Swiderski – Andy you guys all know – to take a look at not the socio-economic, I'm trying to get away from that. It is more economic than it is social at this point, or at least that is the first of it. As everybody knows, GMOB has had difficulty getting what it thinks it needs in a consistent way in the annual reports.

Part of that problem is we have had difficulty articulating what it is we want to see, so we hired these guys. Andy, as you all know, is an economist as well as a land use planner. He spent many years in government and worked on the Perpetual Care Plan. David Stewart was the Chief Statistician for the GNWT and Deputy Minister of Finance. He's now retired from the GNWT. Louise Matthews has a long history in the Department of Finance in the GNWT and does some consulting.

We hired them to help us figure out what we wanted to see so that we could start following trends more effectively. They have done that. The final report will be to us in the next couple of weeks. We will take a look at it. We will put it up on the website, and then we want to talk to the Project Team, in particular, first, to see what their reaction is to the suggestions and recommendations in the report. Then we will take it from there and discuss it with the other Parties as well.

It looks pretty good, and it does provide a tool that we could use to capture the numbers on a consistent basis over time. They tell us that it will actually save time in the long run for the Project Team if it chooses to pick up on this tool. We will see. I hope it will help clear the air. I hope it will help us all understand what money is being spent, where it is going, and from that tease out some of the social implications, but that work is a whole different ballgame. It is more of an economic analysis than it is a socio-economic analysis, and certainly not a social analysis, a social impact analysis. Yeah, we will talk to you, Natalie and others on the Project Team, and see what the reaction is and then discuss it with the other Parties.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

- Natalie: Thank you, and I see that Chris, Alex, and Andre all have questions.
- David: Alright. Who is next? Chris? Are you there, Chris, or are you on mute? There you go. We can see you. We can't hear you yet.
- Natalie: You are back on mute, Chris.
- David: Still can't hear. Is it a volume issue?
- Natalie: Yeah, we can't hear you Chris.
- Ben: Andre is on.
- David: Well, Chris, while you try to figure that out, let's get Andre.
- Andre: Hi, everybody. I'm Andre Torianski from the Project. This is a follow-up to Natalie's comment since we are asking questions about the Annual Report. David, is the review you mentioned focused on the key indicators of the Project that it is tracking, or is the review focused on the socio-economic strategy? I am specifically looking at the recommendation on page 9, 2020-2.
- David: It's both. The consultants did not change any of the key indicators. They used that. They didn't want to reinvent the wheel. There is also some discussion about what could be in the renewed Socio-Economic Strategy, since the current one has expired, I believe.
- Andre: My second question is more or less a comment. The Project is looking at updating the Socio-Economic Strategy by the end of September, so Q2 of this current fiscal year, so it would be amazing if we could see that review beforehand to incorporate any ideas into the upcoming update of the Strategy.
- David: Yeah, absolutely. In fact, we were a little bit concerned about who was going to be ahead on this if the revised Strategy came out prior to having had a look at this consultant report. It would be kind of bad timing. We will definitely provide that to you well in advance of the revised Strategy. I am thinking it would be really helpful if the consultant team itself was part of the discussion so they could explain where they are coming from and their thoughts, certainly far better than I could. We will make that available.
- Andre: Awesome. That sounds like the timing is working out perfectly there. I'm glad to hear that. One last question: Also, on the same page number 9 just above the section Pre-engagement. It says GMOB looks forward to the outcomes of the Yellowknives Dene's socio-economic research focused on Giant Mine scheduled for 2021. Unfortunately, this is the first time I heard of this. Through the working group and the Advisory Body,

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

I haven't heard of YKDFN performing socio-economic research, if you could provide any insight on that.

David: Ben?

Ben: Yeah, Andre, I believe William should be able to talk to that. I believe that there was a study with Queen's University being done. William, do you have any update on that?

William: I'm not 100% sure. Lena Black was our Economic Development Officer, as you know. She has since moved on from that position. I would have to look into it and see what research she was doing, but Ben is right. There was work with Queen's University looking at socio-economics. I could look into that and get back to the Parties, but I can't speak on it right now. It is totally separate from our department, and yeah, I work on all the Environment Department issues.

David: Okay. Thanks, William. Chris, are you...

Chris: Can you hear me now?

David: Yes!

Chris: Sorry about that. You get used to these things after a while. My question was, the improvements, David, are more from a reporting-out on the socio-economics from our perspective. Is that the focus on the report?

David: Yeah, well that is certainly one, and I think that is probably the primary focus. The other part is that Socio-Economic Strategy and...

Chris: Okay, so it would be some...okay. Thank you.

David: Are there any other questions or comments? I mean from a Project Team perspective, it certainly would be helpful to get both our report and anything that William can provide from the Yellowknives to inform the upcoming Strategy. Great. Okay. Are there any other comments on the draft Annual Report?

Jessica M: I just wanted to apologize to everyone for being late. I was in quarantine the last two weeks, so I had to run out to the bank. I didn't know if one of you had asked about the engagement survey that you guys are going to do. Have you spoken to that yet?

David: Yes, we covered it. It is part of the land use planning discussion, engagement, communications, and all of that. We don't have a clear plan just yet. We certainly don't have questions that we want to start asking, and we will work with all the Parties to develop that so it is more effective. Congratulations on your exit from quarantine. I, too, am free to roam the universe.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Jessica M: Yeah, it feels good. Okay, thank you.

Roundtable Highlights from Each Party

David: Next on the agenda I guess, is the roundtable: successes, concerns, and priorities. We might just as well proceed, because I think we are doing great for time. The Government of Canada. You are on first.

Update from the Government of Canada

Natalie: Thank you, David. I, too, am out of quarantine. I have an appointment at 4:00, but it looks like I won't have to leave early since we are doing well on time here.

David: I think we should meet up to celebrate.

Natalie: Exactly. We talk about these items a lot, so I will just give some highlights, perhaps, that GMOB might not be aware of as opposed to covering everything in our Project. The first item I would like to mention is the Quantitative Risk Assessment. We had a recommendation from GMOB to look at the acute toxicity from Ken Froese. I just wanted to provide an update that we have not completed that yet. We are having some contracting difficulties with our QRA consultants. Not difficulties, just challenges getting them onboard. We are working through those, and our plan is to do that acute toxicity assessment this fiscal. We have not forgotten it, and it will be proceeding. We can report back perhaps at our next meeting or before if we have any details on that. I did not see Ken on the distribution. I'm not sure if he is here.

David: He's here.

Ken F: I am here.

Natalie: I don't know if you have any questions on that, Ken, but I just wanted to reassure GMOB that we are taking that recommendation seriously, and it will be proceeding.

Ken F: Yes, thank you. I was going to ask about the status of that. Thanks for beating me to that question.

Natalie: Great. That's what I am trying to do. If there are no other questions on the QRA, the second item is the Perpetual Care Plan. I wanted to provide an update. Alex has taken the lead for the Project. We have started...You probably saw an email where we delayed some of the workshops for this summer. It was triggered mostly from the City, Todd taking time off. We started to just reassess all of our capacity from stakeholders and the Project Team. With the latest COVID lockdowns, a lot of our staff with children are not able to dedicate the time, I guess, so we started to prioritize

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021

what items we could delay. I don't want to say delay, but postpone. The Perpetual Care Plan was one that came to light.

We have postponed the summer work to begin this fall. I will let Alex pipe in if he wants to add anything more to that. It isn't that it is not important to us. It is very important to us. We want to take it very seriously, but we want it done right, and we want to make sure we can dedicate our full attention to it. Right now, we were just finding that was not happening with COVID and then as well with remediation starting right now and getting all our regulatory approvals. We are very stressed, and we are cognizant of our stakeholder's time and our Project members' time. So, that was a decision we have taken, to slightly delay the Perpetual Care Plan.

Alex: Natalie, maybe if I could just add one thing there. We did hold the first workshop, which really was to get feedback on a proposed approach for how we would go about drafting a statement of work. It was really getting that initial feedback from everyone on the Task Force to make sure that we are on track for the actual workshops that would come up in the fall.

We think by holding the first workshop now still allows us time to get the feedback to appropriately scope the subsequent workshops, which is where the bulk of the work will take place for drafting that statement of work. So, we have still progressed, and we have not wasted that very first workshop. We just think bundling these in a way that the subsequent three workshops come later in the year makes more sense than trying to proceed with all of them at once. There is still value in the work that has been done. I just wanted to note that as well.

David: We've talked about this. GMOB talked about this the other day at the meeting last week. The question for us was could you not hire somebody to do some of the preparatory work so that instead of laying it all on yourselves, on the Project Team, and we all appreciate how busy you guys are, that you could find somebody to do some of the pulling together of the pieces that do not necessarily have to wait until the fall, but would help advance the discussions in the fall, rather than letting the summer go by without any additional work being done? We would certainly encourage that approach.

I think part of the challenge is writing the RFP in a way that has the benefit of people involved at both ends of that spectrum, to have written RFPs and to have responded to them. Somebody, perhaps a small team of course, who would not be bidding on the RFP itself. That was part of the discussion way back when. We all appreciate the effort you are putting into involving the Parties in it, but I just have to wonder if there is not something that could be done over the summer by hiring the right person to effectively put together a more advanced draft that could then be considered in the fall.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Alex: I'll just note that really what will happen now in terms of next steps is once we have feedback on this process piece that we have put forward, which is essentially how we are going to go about this series of workshops to pull together what exactly we are asking from a consultant to do, to refine that statement of work.

We are working with PSPC and Roxane Poulin. We hired Roxane to help facilitate these workshops. She has been part of all of the up-front discussions to scope the workshops in a way that gives us what we need as an output at the other end. So, there will be work still ongoing once we get feedback from the task force at the end of this month.

I think one of the main things was we had a bit of a check-in with the task force after the second workshop where the bulk of the work will happen to see if we need to on-board someone else to support further. I think we are on track, David, with still getting the approach finessed and those workshops further scoped this summer. It won't just stop now. We will still continue doing that work in the background, and then we will bring that forward at that second workshop and show what we have done to incorporate feedback and really how that process will look from there. I think we are on track for something like what you are proposing.

David: We will send in some comments on the process itself, but what I am thinking is that there is not a need - I contradict myself sometimes but maybe there is not a need to have so many workshops. Maybe some of that work can be presented and considered at a workshop rather than using the workshop to thrash out what you are going to present at the next workshop. Anyhow, we will send in some suggestions.

Alex: Great, thanks. Does anybody else have any questions?

Natalie: If there are no others on the Perpetual Care, I just had a couple of other items to update on, our Monitoring and maintenance plans. They are all in, so woohoo for our Project. That was a big success. As well, I want to just thank everyone for hanging in with us, doing the thorough reviews, and being part of the process. Thanks. Much appreciated. Now we just wait approvals and then move on to our construction and design plans with the target of starting remediation in July.

With that, I will put it out to the team if there is anything else they would like to update.

Chris: Maybe just a quick note, Natalie, on COVID in general and how that has impacted the Project. As everybody knows, this past year, the challenges faced and the ability of the Project to adapt and react to what has been put in front of us is, in my opinion, remarkable. It is remarkable what the Project Team has been able to achieve, and you guys with your comments on our Monitoring and maintenance plans, and helping to keep that momentum forward so we can start immediate work this summer. Hats off

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

to everybody for that. Nobody ever predicted something like this, certainly to this degree that we are seeing right now.

The Project Team is spread out from British Columbia all the way to the Maritimes. We are competing with the different stay-at-home orders, and some areas we are able to get back online and have more freedom than others. Trying to integrate all that with the personal side of the Project members has been a real challenge. I can say, for the most part, we have seen little slippage on a lot of the things. I mean, certainly like the thing we just talked about with the Perpetual Care Plan has to be adjusted somewhat, but from the Project perspective, I think we are seeing some good results there.

Now, it certainly has taken its toll on some of the members. Just like you guys, the last thing you want to see again is another management monitoring plan to review. With that, I just wanted to give some kudos to the Project and how integrated this whole Project is with you guys. Thanks. I hope we can continue to move forward and we get out of this pandemic sooner than later. Thanks.

David: Andre, you have your hand up. Do you have a comment or question?

Andre: I was going to provide a socio-economic update, unless there are any questions for Chris.

David: No, I'm just echoing his sentiments that the Project Team, in particular, has done an incredible job in getting the stuff through. Andre?

Andre: I already mentioned that we are looking to update the Socio-economic Strategy. In terms of the Socio-economic Action Plan I can see here listed on the agenda, the original Action Plan was added as an appendix at the end of the Socio-Economic Strategy. I am sure most of the Parties here recall that we have updated or expanded on the Action Plan.

Since February 2020, the Project has been working on putting together a Socio-economic Implementation Plan. We have been working with it, and with the Parties, through the Socio-Economic Working Group and the Advisory Body, for over a year. We thought it would be a great opportunity to update it. We have been working on updating the Socio-Economic Implementation Plan based on lessons learned throughout this year and based on what we heard back from the focus groups that we have been holding since Q3 and Q4 of the last fiscal year.

We have held, just in case you guys are not aware, we held the focus groups with the City of Yellowknife's Mayoral Task Force for Economic Development. We held this focus group with the Social Impact Management Focus Group. We have held focus groups with NSMA and Yellowknives Dene First Nations, and there are discussions going on to have a focus group with the Tlîchô as well.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021

The input that is gathered that was provided at those focus groups is now being incorporated into the updates of the Implementation Plan. The plans for that Implementation Plan is for it to stay evergreen, so we are going to be updating it on a regular basis as priorities change and as things evolve on the socio-economic side of things.

One other thing is our socio-economic governance. GMOB has been added to the Socio-economic Advisory Body as an observer, similar to the Socio-economic Working Group, and you will be seeing an invitation going out for the next meeting. We are looking to hold the next meeting the middle to end of June. Some of the topics for discussion at that meeting are going to be the proposed changes to the socio-economic governance structure and updates to the Implementation Plan itself that I just mentioned.

For the governance structure, we are not looking to making any changes to the Socio-economic Advisory Body, but we are looking to modify the Socio-economic Working Group. More details on that will be provided at the Advisory Body meeting. I'm sure you would have seen through the working group the recommendations and the input that we put forward at our last meeting for our proposed changes to the governance structure. I don't have any other updates for socio-economic, unless there are any questions.

David: Thanks, Andre. Are there any questions?

(Pause)

Alright. Anything else, Natalie, from your group that you can think of?

Natalie: I guess we have one other item. It is more of a concern, I guess. Just going back into the Environmental Agreement, we have a Status of Environment Report that is due in June 2022. Seven years, I think, is the exact timing. We are just starting to plan on that. I guess it's a heads-up. We may look for an extension on that to push it back to December of 2022. I know Katherine Ross may have some more to add on this, but just with the timing of our reporting, timing, and getting all those reports together, we think it might be a challenge to make that deadline, even though it is still a year out. That's just a head-up.

David: Okay. Katherine Ross, any comment on that?

Katherine: Can people hear you? Am I clear?

(Several acknowledgements in the affirmative)

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

May 17, 2021

Excellent. As Natalie said, we have been looking at our timing for it. We are starting work on it so we can get a decent product in. One of our challenges, as you know, is the translation requirements that we have right now for our products. We are collecting our data to report on up until next January, but if we have to get everything translated and go through all of the review process that we do need to do for something of this magnitude, then it would give us maybe a month to actually write the report before we would have to start getting into translation and things like that. It is a bit of a stretch, I think.

David: Yeah, I certainly appreciate that. Maybe one of the things you could do is what you did with the Annual Report and provide a draft. That does not have to be translated. That would certainly help.

Katherine: For sure, we will definitely keep that in mind. I think, just looking at Natalie nodding, that is for sure a possibility. Thanks.

David: Okay.

Natalie: I guess based on that comment, David, you found that getting the draft of our Annual Report helpful as well, ahead of time?

David: Oh yeah, very much.

Natalie: Then we will continue to endeavour to do that then.

David: That was great. Thank you. Are there any final questions of the Government of Canada?

Jessica M: I guess, David, on the survey note, I just wanted to let you know that we will start also gathering stakeholder input on how they are finding the various meetings going and what sort of approach they prefer. We had that as one of the comments through the Board process on the Engagement Plan, so I guess I just wanted to let everybody know that we will be starting to do that. It might just be as simple as a two-minute survey at the end of meetings to get your input. We are considering a few different options, but we will be doing that as well.

David: That works for us too. Great. Okay, well, we can always come back if there are questions people have. We will just go to the GNWT now.

GNWT Update

Alex: Diep, do you want me to get started, or ...

Diep: Sure. Go ahead, Alex. Just so everyone knows, I have to run to another meeting for an hour, and I will call right back.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

David: Alright. Thanks.

Alex: Maybe I will just start with the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè update. I'm sure as most of us are aware, this work is delayed, or the implementation of this study is delayed, primarily because of COVID. The implementation of this study is really dependent upon the NWT lifting the next phase of COVID restrictions for them to conduct their in-person component of the work.

What has been happening to date is we have still been meeting with the Advisory Committee and the Technical Committee. There has been a number of items that have been required to complete or to do in the meantime to prepare for implementation. The study team is customizing. They have a call-track system for their software for their survey. They are customizing that survey appropriately.

There are also a number of documents that they are preparing for patient care, documents that folks would fill out when they are going to give blood for the biomarker component, also to take part in the survey. So, a lot of that up-front work is still taking place that is needed before the study can actually be implemented anyway. It is still moving along.

The study team is hiring a project coordinator. The previous coordinator did not renew their contract for this year, so that position is posted on the Wilfrid Laurier website, and it closes as of June 1st if folks know any potential candidates.

Kynyn, who was the lead for this work as well as the Health Effects Monitoring Program for the Yellowknives Dene First Nation, is off on maternity leave, so they have replaced Kynyn's role. Aleisha Betsina and Clarel Jupiter are sharing the workload between those two studies for the YKDFN. Just on ethics approval, at the last April Advisory Meeting, Dr. Chan gave us an update that they are getting very close to submission for ethics, and it would be approximately a six-week turnaround time for the Ethics Committee to conduct their review.

Things are moving along but really dependent on COVID. I will just see if Katherine Ross has anything to add on that update.

Katherine: No, that is a good update, Alex. I think that being one of the challenges with the ethics approval going in as well, is just making sure that we have all of the considerations for COVID covered. As we all know, it is a big unknown as to when to oh, hey, go ahead guys.

David: Yeah. Are there any other questions or observations from folks on that?

Diep: David, can I just give a quick update before I have to run?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

David: Sure.

Diep: In terms of the letter that the Minister of Lands sent out to GMOB and the City of Yellowknife specifically, I just wanted to update. Like Alex said earlier, we have reached out to the City, and we do have a meeting planned with the City. I think we are just waiting to get some preferred dates from them. We will meet as a group and determine next steps and get a better understanding from the City in terms of their concerns.

David: Okay. Thanks, Diep. It will be interesting to see what the resolution is in all of this.

Diep: Okay. Talk soon.

David: Alex, I have just one question on the ethics review. I was involved in a relatively small Wilfrid Laurier project this past winter. I still have some involvement in it. This was a really small project, and it took longer than six weeks to get it through, so just a heads-up. The folks at Wilfrid Laurier don't necessarily understand the context of COVID in the NWT. It takes a lot of explaining sometimes, so be prepared for that sort of thing.

Alex: Yeah, David, that was certainly one of the things that has delayed this. There were a lot of other additional documents required related to COVID, specifically their approach for COVID protocols for all of their in-person work. We hope that is something that they have already incorporated, but that is noted for sure.

Diep: Some of the delay has also been going through the Wilfrid Laurier legal and ethics review on their side before it even goes to the Research Ethics Board. We have had a lot of good discussions with the team. With the folks on the line who have been involved, thank you all, because there has been a lot of good input. Alex has worked really hard to get the input as well from the GNWT side of things, so that has been really useful.

David: Okay. Thanks. Yeah, the university bureaucracy is a wonder to behold at times. I had no idea until I got into it a little bit. Alright, is there anything else from the GNWT? Alex, do you have anything else?

Alex: Yeah, I just wanted to note that one of the things for GNWT is we have hired Jeff Rosnawski who is on this call as part of GNWT's team on the Project. We are really pleased to have him on board.

One of the things we have been working hard on is finalizing our Offsite risk assessment. I know this has been a discussion for a long time. We are pleased to say that we have dates for engagement in June. We are planning a series of engagement sessions, the first one being with the North Slave Métis Alliance on June 1st, and then

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

subsequently with the City of Yellowknife. We are setting up a meeting date with the Yellowknives Dene First Nation, and then June 17th we have a public forum.

Early next week, I will circulate with everyone on this call, and it will be circulated widely. It will be a webinar similar to what Giant did for their public forum this year. We will have CanNorth present the results of the risk assessment and have a bit of a Q&A publicly. So, we are pleased that work will be out there for folks to have for the summer.

On top of that, we have been working hard on one of our priorities of how we communicate those results in a way that makes sense for the broader public that is not necessarily intimately involved with Giant and understanding arsenic. We have Claire McAuley on board who you all know. She has been supporting us on the comms and engagement front. We have developed a results video as well as a results brochure for that risk assessment that we will share once we do the engagement or during the engagement sessions. We think those are really good tools for sharing the results of this work.

I guess one more thing to note is there have also been some outstanding questions outside of the risk assessment that were not necessarily being addressed. One of those was related to garden produce. We are funding Mike Palmer with Aurora Research Institute, Queens, and Royal Military College to conduct a garden produce study. They are going into their second year of work, and those results will give the public a better understanding of what the risks are for growing vegetables in their home gardens in and around Yellowknife, Ndilo, and Dettah. We are happy with that work.

We have also incorporated a grayling memo into that Offsite risk assessment. We heard concerns from the YKDFN around what happens if someone catches a grayling and eats it that may have been in Baker Creek. What are the risks associated with that? So, we will have a separate memo included in our Offsite risk assessment that will talk about the results of that work. Yeah, that is pretty much it. Jeff, I don't know if you have anything to add.

Jeff: Oh my gosh. We have been working with the GNWT, the ECE, on developing a training hub to be a tool for training providers as well as trainers and employers. We are in the middle of developing a website with Arctic Response. That is all I can add at this time. It is nice to meet everyone.

David: Great. Thanks.

Alex: I think that is it for us, David, unless there are questions.

David: Are there any questions from folks?

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

May 17, 2021

Ken F: I have a question. I was trying to find my hand-raise thing, and I don't seem to find it here. Alex, on the Offsite risk assessment, I know there is some work going on with revising the background value for arsenic in the Yellowknife area. I looked at it, and I forget some of the details, but is all of that being incorporated into the Risk Assessment and in the garden produce study, and stuff like that?

Alex: Yeah, it certainly is. Our Environmental Protection folks are doing that work, and they are finalizing their new quality guidelines. I think it was scheduled for this week. All of those numbers and the background numbers that were used for that work are also incorporated into the Offsite risk assessment.

Ken F: Okay, so if that results in calculated or estimated risk differences between what has been done before now using the 2002 background, or whenever that was established versus now where the background value is decreasing significantly, how is communication on that going to proceed?

Alex: Just so I'm following, Ken... Originally, the Offsite risk assessment included the background number that was used in the current guidelines. We revised it totally, but these results have not been publicly shared. So, is the question has the risk changed from the initial work that Harriet did for the Offsite risk assessment versus now with the new numbers and how we would we communicate that change?

Ken F: Yeah, I guess. If we are looking at any risk assessments or any soil numbers between 2002 and now, the current guideline as we move into the new guideline, obviously risk calculations will change, because your value from Yellowknife will be viewed differently in relation to the guideline, right?

So, on paper or on a computer, we could see that risks have suddenly and dramatically increased. Whether they are above the Health Canada threshold beyond a minimal or negligible risk or not, on paper, it could show that it jumped two or three times. I am just wondering whether that is something that you have talked about. I'm sure Claire would be aware of it. It is not to say that real risks have changed, right? The soil is still the same as it was last year, even if the guidance on the background calculation is different. Some of the conclusions in a report may change because of those numbers.

Alex: That is certainly a consideration when we are talking about engaging on this, especially now that there is conversation with Mike Palmer's work that just came out where he was looking at natural background on a regional scale, and then the timing with these guideline revisions for sure. Certainly, it is something that we consider through this work.

I guess from a Project perspective, for the HHERA, the results of that risk assessment that used the previous numbers, we would have those results as well to talk about to show that the risks were still low to very low in that Offsite risk assessment. For this one, since it has not been communicated publicly yet, these are the results with the

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

new numbers. Yeah, I hope I am not missing something here. It is certainly a consideration that we have been discussing for how we engage and how we discuss things like background when we take this back in June.

Ken F: I don't know how many people, say at an annual meeting, would note the differences, but for so long, the background in Yellowknife has been considered to be 150 mg/kg. I don't remember what the projected number is now, but it is substantially lower than that. There is always a period of time to educate people to say well, risks have not increased, and we are just calculating differently now.

Alex: For sure. For sure. It is something that we will certainly speak to. We talk about how we use background in the risk assessment when we report back, so it will be something that we discuss. I am sure that there is going to be some questions on it just based on the timing of Mike's work as well. We will happy to speak to those.

Ken F: Good. Thank you.

David: Anyone else? Are there any other questions?

Tony: If I could just have a quick comment related to the upcoming updated criteria. How would that be factored into the remedial criteria for cleanup, if at all? Is there going to be any adjustment related to the new criteria?

Alex: Natalie, do you want to...

Natalie: We have already been asked this question, and we submitted our Closure and Reclamation Plan and had Board approval based on the current criteria. Also to note that we consider the criteria we are using to be site-specific criteria, because we did confirm them through the HHERA. So, they are not just solely based on the guideline. They are risk-based criteria, so we don't envision changing them.

David: Todd?

Tony: I'm just thinking about those criteria. We are informed, in part, based on what the regional baseline assumptions are in terms of arsenic concentrations, which have changed since that site-specific risk assessment was done. I was just wondering if maybe that aspect of the criteria will need to be revisited or not.

Natalie: I believe we had a lot of this data going into the risk assessment. Harriet was aware of a lot of the regional soil data. That was considered when we did our risk assessment.

Tony: Okay. Thanks, Natalie.

David: Thanks. Todd, you have your hand up?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Todd: I just want to add to Tony's question there. I would ask the same thing, and Natalie, you may want to send your response to everyone here. My angle on the question was a little bit different. My angle was I remember the Project saying, I think at least twice, for sure in the Greenstone on a sunny day, I think, that you guys would adhere to the GNWT guidelines. I remember being very shocked by that at the time, because we were talking about the change.

I leave that in everyone's hands as to whether someone wants to go and try and find that in the working group minutes, or potentially in the transcripts. Natalie makes a precise point in her email, and to my memory, the commitment is much broader than that. That's my recollection.

David: Is there any further discussion on that for this moment?

(Pause)

I'm not hearing any. Anything else? Going once...going twice... Okay, Alternatives North. You are next.

Alternatives North Update

Katharine: Hi, everyone. I have a fairly brief update for you all since we last met in December. Gordon, Michael, and I continue to work on this Project on behalf of Alternatives North. Over these past few months, we committed to review and provide comments on the few final Monitoring and Management plans. We also continue to participate fully in the various engagement meetings for the Socio-economic Advisory Body, Perpetual Care Plan Task Force, and the Aquatics Advisory Committee, as well as the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè Study Advisory Committee, also known as the HW Study Advisory Committee.

I just wanted to highlight that as a committee in particular, we have started meeting again more regularly since the beginning of the new year. Alternatives North is pleased to see that the study leads are really listening to our feedback and feedback from other parties and incorporating that into the study and making those changes. We look forward to seeing that go through once COVID restrictions allow.

Just quickly, speaking of COVID, it has been over a year now since we have been existing in a pandemic state. I just wanted to say that I am really happy with how the Project and everyone involved has shifted to online meetings. I think they went really well and are going very well. I am looking forward to being able to meet again in person, hopefully soon. I will let Gordon and Michael speak if they want to add anything else.

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

May 17, 2021

Gordon: That is fine, Katharine. Thanks for the offer. I appreciate your report.

David: Gordon, are you competing with Michael in the beard category?

Gordon: Do you think it's a competition?

David: Interesting. Alright, are there any questions of Alternatives North? Michael, did you have anything to say?

Michael: I think Katharine has already said it. It has continued to be a joy to work with all of you, and I continue to be duly impressed by all of the fine work done by pretty much everybody. I feel very pleased to have climbed Mount Design Plan with all of the different monitoring and management plans. It looks like everything is moving in the directions that I am hoping it will. As long as we continue on the path we are on, it seems like good news.

David: We all agree. That's good. Are there any questions for Alternatives North from anyone?

(Pause)

Great. Okay. North Slave Métis Alliance is up now.

NSMA Update

Jess H: Can you hear me okay?

David: Yes.

Jess H: Good. Hi, everyone. I have a fairly brief update from us as well. We have been, like everybody else, pretty impressed at how much work has been done considering that we are in this pandemic. For rough numbers, I do not have an exact number here, but I was doing our financial report recently, and I think between Adelaide and I, we have had over 70 individual meetings relating to Giant Mine over the past year with me attending at least 60 of those over 70. For context, there were 52 the previous year, so we have been busy, busy, busy.

I think that is just an indicator of how this whole working group works really, really hard to strive to push the Remediation Project onward. I applaud every individual here who has gotten those steps together, and I thank the GMRP for continuing to push through it as opposed to just letting it stall with a big question mark that is COVID, so thank you for continuing to do that work.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Some things we have gotten done in the last year was finishing up the QRA process, and then we started on the Aquatics Advisory Committee, socio-ec discussions, and the Hoèła weteèts'eèdè Study. We started on educational resources for potential teaching on Giant Mine and NSMA's impact and the relationship with that. We continue to host Bill Slater as our technical advisor to the working group, and the very large mountain, as Michael referred to it for the MMP and the design plans, and then just continuing on the Perpetual Care Plan. We really look forward to seeing how the PCP will move forward, and then also how land use discussions move forward too.

I think it is another year done for myself in my role as representative for NSMA for Giant. I continue to get great feedback from members that are getting increasingly more dedicated and wanting to participate more and more in communities that are involved with Giant Mine. I look forward to any opportunities where members can provide input, and they definitely feel like their voices are being heard. Thank you.

David: That's great. Thanks, Jess. Are there any comments from folks? The Project Team is getting all kinds of accolades today.

Chris (?): Sorry for all the meetings.

Jess H: That's okay. It's one of those things where we have had more meetings because in a way, we can more easily have them online, I guess.

David: Well, I am personally looking forward to some in-person meetings too, though.

Jess H: Agreed.

David: Alright. Are there any questions of the North Slave Métis?

(Pause)

Seeing none, hearing none, then it is the Yellowknives Dene. William?

YKDFN Update

William: Hi, everyone. I'm happy to be here for another semi-annual meeting to give my update. As you all know, COVID has impacted just about every way of how we operate in the office here. It has been very challenging to say the least, reaching out to community members, having meetings, etcetera, etcetera. Our offices were shut down, then reopened, and then shut down again. Now we are reopened back today. As you all know, COVID has impacted us, and it is continuing to impact us.

We received funding and had the MMPs pre-reviewed, which Meritt did on our behalf. We submitted these comments to the Project in the pre-review, and we followed-up

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

May 17, 2021

with any outstanding concerns to the Board through their official process. I really appreciate the funding that the Project gave to this regard, because if it was not given, that work would not have been done. We had a million things on the go, as you all are aware, so I appreciate that that happened.

It is difficult to talk on the socio-ec items and the Hoèla weteèts'eèdè Study, as neither of those are within our Environment Department. In terms of the HW Study, as Alex mentioned, we have had Kynyn working on it. She is on maternity leave, and currently we have two staff working on it. They are under Jennifer Drygeese, our Wellness Director, so it is difficult for me to talk on it, because they are a separate department from us. Similar, our Economic Development Department is separate from our Environment Department, so it is difficult to speak on what Lena was doing prior to her moving.

In terms of our priorities or concerns, depending upon how you look at it, is the dust coming off the site. Our community remains concerned with the dust or possibility of dust. We have had a bit of discussion in this regard and will continue to discuss it with the Project. We would like to look at ways to address the concerns, maybe having visual photos so community members can be reassured, or some kind of way to comfort the community. There is still a definite concern from our membership.

I am also curious about the spill report we received this morning. I'm wondering if these reports can be reported to the working group, or at least to myself when they happen. I feel as though I need to be aware of these events for the benefit of my community, so I would appreciate if that could be taken up as a suggestion.

Looking forward, I am looking forward to the AIA field work ahead of us. We have Elders lined up, and our TK specialist, Randy. This type of work is very exciting for our membership, as it is not very often that we can participate and recognize our history in an actual physical form. So, we are really excited for that.

We have also been working on a TK brochure with Alex and Jeff. That is coming along nicely, which will be a great addition to our resources. I am sure there are other items in between, but I think I will just leave it at that.

David: Are there any questions or observations of William's presentation?

Natalie: I will just say, yes William, we heard about this spill report. I did mean to update the working group last weekend. It just probably slipped my mind. We will certainly in the future do that.

David: Okay. Thanks, Natalie. Are there any other comments?

Jessica M: William, I actually did send you an update late, late Friday on the dust, so it actually would be great if maybe we could touch base after this meeting and just talk about if

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

that sort of thing works. You maybe were just a bit too busy today to look at it closely. Anyway, we are definitely willing to work with helping you get more information out to your membership however we can with photos and that sort of thing.

William: Alright. Sounds good.

David: Anything else? I'm going to suggest we go to Todd next and then take a 10-minute break. Does that work for folks? Todd?

Male: Todd may have signed off.

Kathy: He looks like he signed off, yeah.

David: Okay, so Kerry, are you there?

City of Yellowknife Update

Kerry: Yeah, Todd signed off a little early today. I don't have too much to update. I think as everyone is aware, Todd is taking some time off over the summer, so we are just reevaluating how we are going to keep up with the Giant Mine Project over the next couple of months to make sure we are still actively participating where we feel we can be effective.

We still do have Shin Shiga. He is a subcontractor, and he is still going to participate in the Human Health Effects part of the program, but he is really looking at being most active on the socio-economic part of the file. We see that is where it is most effective. We are feeling that the City's capacity and expertise at present to participate in the technical reviews is probably where we can be the most effective. We have already been through the licensing stage. We have voiced our concerns and comments many times. We feel like between GMOB and the technical expert, we can rely on that kind of expertise for the technical reviews, so I really see the focus to be on the socio-economic side. We feel like that is where we would want to see more action, and we really want to see benefits coming out of that for the City and proper residents and the territory.

Other than that, we are happy to participate and glad to see the semi-annual report come out. Todd already made a few comments at the beginning. That was really with the blessing of the City. Subject to any questions, that is it for me.

David: Questions of Kerry and the City? Are there any observations?

(Pause)

Okay. Hearing none and seeing none, how about we take a 10-minute break? It is almost 2:30, so be back at 2:40? Alright.

Break

David: Are most of us back? I think so. What I will do fairly quickly is go through our report of activities, which you have all received a copy of. Then I will turn it over to individual Board members to update in areas that we have skipped over or skimmed over briefly.

Report of Activities

David: Budget-wise, we are just under a million. I know that because we are tied to the CPI, and we actually had a reduction in our budget this year of 1.4%, because the CPI in the NWT has dropped by 1.4%. That was kind of curious. The core operations budget is about 72%, whereas the Research Program budget is about 28%. I will get Tony to update on the Research Program a little later, but we have some good news from our TERRE-NET partners.

The work plan submitted to CIRNAC was approved, obviously, because we got the grant on time again. There are a number of other documents that are attached to the Report of Activities. The GMOB Activity Summary: Like everybody else, we have been largely taken up by the monitoring and management plans and all that related engagement.

The socio-economic stuff we have talked about already. Unless anybody has any questions, we will skip over that.

For the Education Module, we have Graystone Consulting working on that project, and Ben can probably update us better than I could on that.

The Annual Report, we have discussed. It will be out in the next couple of weeks. Like everyone else, we have been attending meetings. We have attended 64. I don't know how that fits in the ranking of who has attended more meetings, but that is spread over the entire Board rather than just one person, so there you go.

Media session with the Yellowknifer, I did that months ago. I don't think anything ever came of that. Apparently, I successfully confused them, so they did not want to come back with anything.

Website archive updates are being updated as required. The Vee Lake turn-off ice buildup. The Project Team was very responsive to that. A member of the public approached us with some concerns there.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

The five-year review we have talked about. The Research Program, I will again get back to Tony on that. Kathy has also organized some posters with a group called Fuse Consulting, and they are on the website.

The expert panel: We have set up a standard template for new proposals, and that is on the website. We have one unsolicited proposal. We have some comments and concerns related to that, and it will be referred to the expert panel for their review as well.

Arsenic samples: The Remediation Project has taken the lead on supplying those samples. I can't remember. What was the volume? Three hundred kilos?

Ben: Six hundred.

David: Six hundred kilos. Thank you very much for the support there. It is very much appreciated. Then there is the Dundee Project. They have vitrified the arsenic samples, and they have been sent to the University of Waterloo, the TERRE-NET folks, for testing. In a nutshell, that is about it.

The appendices I will not go through. They are there for you to look at to provide your questions, concerns, or comments as you see fit. Are there any comments on that very brief overview before I turn it to the committee members to provide their own updates?

Natalie: I just wanted to make a comment under the arsenic sample. It was saying the regulatory process was headed by CIRNAC. There really wasn't a regulatory process, so I just want to be clear that for the future samples, there will be a regulatory process that won't be led by CIRNAC. I just don't want it to look like we actually led a process, because it is covered under our current permit.

David: Yeah, and for folks that don't know, the Project Team has been working with us to get some additional arsenic samples out of the stopes and storage areas. The Land and Water Board has concluded that it does not need to go through any additional regulatory hurdles. It is covered under the current license, so we are good to go on that. It was a cooperative effort between the Land and Water Board Project Team and GMOB, particularly Tony and others. Is there anything else from anyone?

(Pause)

Alright, then why don't I turn to each of the Board members in turn, and Paul and Ben as well, to give a brief update from their own personal perspectives from the stuff they have been involved in. I will start with Ken Hall.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Ken H: Thank you, David. I don't have a lot to report or say today. Unfortunately, because of the position we are in these days, I was going to be one to bring sort of a view from the street to our meetings, talking with residents both new and long-term residents. I haven't been able to have a lot of those conversations lately, and I'm looking forward to the ability to do that being restored.

I would like to acknowledge the efforts that have been made by everybody working on this file, working on the Project, to carry on and keep plugging away despite the conditions we are under. I would really like to acknowledge the great effort made by those who have managed to keep this thing moving forward. I am really looking forward to actually seeing some work being done on the property this summer during the construction season.

Maybe there is a little bit of personal bias showing through being a boater, but I would especially like to acknowledge the work that has been done to ensure the continued use of the Giant boat launch and parking area by the boating community. I know we are very seasonal people up here. Our window of opportunity for boating is brief relative to the rest of the country except for those north of us. I would just like to say it is one of those things that really affects a lot of people, and a lot of people had a lot of concern about it. Even though it is that silent majority that you tend not to hear from in the public, certainly I heard a lot about it personally.

I would just like to say that the efforts that are being made towards doing that work will go a long way, I think, to help generate some public confidence in the Project overall. Without any further ado, I would like to reiterate that I look forward to meeting again in person. Thank you.

David: Thank you, Ken. The other Ken?

Ken F: Hi, everyone. The meeting online has gotten a little bit old, I think, for all of us. I am looking forward to the chance to meet in person again. One of the things that does is reduce the possibility and all that goes with it with trying to multitask during meetings. You turn your video off, and nobody knows what you are doing. We can get back to focusing on one thing at a time, and I think that is good.

Meetings on both the HEMPAC and the HW Study: The HEMPAC is in a results evaluation mode. There are a number of research papers coming out of the U of Ottawa group. I have been involved in those reviews and meetings. The HW Study - the stress study - has taken a lot of shape over the past year. Sometimes we wonder why it is taking so long to get things moving with the research ethics submission and such like, but many of those are related to COVID and all the requirements that Wilfrid Laurier has.

On that study, I know there has been a fair bit of trepidation from various people on how that study is being set up or has been set up. I think throughout this past year,

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

May 17, 2021

we have seen a lot of improvement, really just filling in the gaps that we did not understand were in the background of designing that study. Through GMOB and through myself, we have engaged Sandy Burns to help us as an expert in that field. That has certainly helped my confidence, and I think others, in knowing that study is being done as well or better than probably any other study that looks at mental health in that community survey type of respect.

So, we are happy to have Sandy continue on the Technical Committee for that project and look to her for the guidance or the acknowledgment that study is on the right track. I have great hopes for that study helping the communities, helping the overall Yellowknife region in understanding what could be done on a public health basis to improve the community. I think that is all I have right now. Thanks again for everyone's attendance here. I will pass it on to the next one.

David: Kathy?

Kathy: Hi, folks. I guess what I have done the most of lately was working on the Annual Report, but also being part of the Aquatic Effects Advisory Committee. There have been a few meetings lately. I have been really impressed actually by the Aquatic Advisory Committee meetings in terms of the quality of the meetings and the pre-meetings the Project Team is doing with the different communities. It is quite amazing. I feel at the meetings that everyone is engaged, understands what is going on, asks good questions, and brings up good suggestions. I think that engagement in particular, that is the one I have been most involved in, and I think it is going really, really well.

I think as David mentioned, we are trying to develop some more plain language ourselves, because now we have to keep up with you guys on the Research Program. We are getting to the point where we need to do more communications about the Research Project and the progress on that. It is hard for a lot of people to understand the Research Project. It is very complicated in some ways, so we have been working with some people to help us come up with some infographics. Some of those were in the Annual Report, but there is more stuff to come there. So, yeah, I will be working on communications for the time being.

David: Great. Thanks, Kathy. Mark?

Mark: Hello, everybody. This year has been, as you said, a bit different. For me, I'm working a lot on the socio-economic. I think I can help offer some stuff on the Perpetual Care, on a procurement approach and that kind of stuff. I enjoy the monthly working group meetings whenever they happen. I find them quite informative.

The most exciting thing for me probably, is I have been involved with this Project for 20 years on and off in numerous different capacities and we are looking really forward to seeing it start this July. Not that it has not started. I mean the actual

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

physical full-on remediation has been a long time coming. I am really excited about that.

I am also excited about coming back up and seeing everybody. Being by myself down here in Edmonton, it is hard. I am looking forward to all that, and it looks like a lot of progress has been made. I really like the flexibility of the Project Team and all the Parties and everyone involved when working together. I think it is great. I look forward to seeing everybody.

David: Yeah, long time coming. Thanks, Mark. Tony?

Tony: Hi, everybody. As David mentioned with respect to the Research Program, which is one of the areas that I am focusing on, there are a few updates. Some of this was discussed in our last meeting in December. Just to refresh your memories, one of the big changes since then is that this week we were informed by TERRE-NET that a joint proposal between TERRE-NET and GMOB as a partner is being approved by NSERC. It is called the NSERC Alliance Proposal.

What this in essence does is it provides another round of funding that can be used for TERRE-NET to conduct research that is, for the most part, related directly to the Giant Mine. These are projects that are either spinoffs of earlier or ongoing research projects that are already being done by TERRE-NET, or they are slight modifications or different related topics that are being looked at by TERRE-NET that are relevant to the overall question of how to manage arsenic trioxide over the very, very long-term. That is excellent news. It is a significant amount of funding, and it will really enhance our collective ability to move towards finding a solution.

As was mentioned by David as well, we continue to work with Dundee. The contract that we had with them was to take arsenic trioxide and vitrify it. They have completed their responsibilities under that contract. The vitrified product has now been provided to the University of Waterloo, which is now undertaking some tests on that vitrified material, leaching tests and other analyses to confirm how that vitrified product is likely to perform over the long term.

We also had a contract with an institution in the UK called the Wilson Institute that focused at a very high scoping level, different potential extractive technologies that are not commonly used within the mining sector. Our thinking was that obviously, the earlier work that was done during the remediation planning process for the Remediation Project was going to be implemented soon. That was really coming at it from a mining angle.

We also wanted to get the perspectives of professionals in the field that are doing more with materials management that are not limited to the mining sector. We have some feedback from that report. Basically, the conclusions are that there are some promising methods out there, but as we expected, many of the challenges are

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

associated with human contact, with the arsenic trioxide dust. There is nothing new there. What is new is obviously the development of robotic mining techniques and extractive techniques that we are now following up with. Your uranium industry here in Canada, in particular, Cameco Corporation, we have reached out to them, and they are in the process of setting up some meetings to look at some of the remote extraction technologies that they use in their high-grade uranium mining operations in Saskatchewan.

Our independent review panel that we have established to look at unsolicited research proposals that we have received, has met several times to develop, in essence, a methodology for reviewing incoming proposals, as well as a template that can be used by proponents of research or organizations that are looking for funding so that we can standardize these submissions that we receive from those organizations.

A point of clarification, I think, and I am not totally sure, and I'm looking to Natalie to chime in on this, but David was describing the regulatory process related to extraction of the additional sample that is required. There was mention that there were some discussions with the MVLWB, and the MVLWB had determined that additional regulatory instruments are not required. If I am correct, I think that was a determination by the Project Team, and it was not per se, a decision by the MVLWB. Is that right, Natalie?

Natalie: That is correct. There was an informal discussion, but there was no decision. It was just that the activities we were talking about are already permitted, so it was more just advice, I guess. We did not go for full formal.

Tony: Right. Just to clarify for our record in the event, it appeared there was a formal decision by the Board.

Natalie: Thank you.

Tony: That is really it on the Research Program. Just like others, though, what Mark just said, he said he has been in various capacities connected to the Project for 20 years. For me, it is not quite that long. It is more like 15, but it is really fantastic to see where things are going. It is exciting that the core project will be initiated this summer. Just reflecting on the time that I have been exposed to the Project, I can say that there really has been a significant positive evolution in the Project over the years. It has been impressive to see those improvements. That is not to say that there is not always room for improvement. Of course, there will be things in the future that GMOB continues to identify, and others, things that could be improved further. Kudos to everybody for the progress that has been made, and of course, over the past year, which has had its unique challenges. Thank you very much.

David: Thanks, Tony. Paul, are there any updates from you?

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Paul: Yeah, I have primarily been working on the regulatory submissions, the MMPs and the design plans with support from various Board members, GMOB Board members, as appropriate. I appreciate the Board's input always.

Just a note on those: The approach the Project took with the pre-engagement, I think that was a really good way to do it. It is one of the limitations within the MVLWB process. There is not much opportunity for discussion. Once the plans are out, the comments go in, and the Board makes their decision. So, just a note, I found the pre-engagement to be really quite helpful in the overall process. I recognize that it was an extra step that the GMRP took on and an extra level of work, but I think it helped the overall process a lot. That is pretty much it for me.

David: Thank you, Paul. Ben?

Natalie: Can I just add something? Thank you for that, Paul. I will make sure the regulatory team hears that. They have all stressed that that step was very, very onerous for them, so I am sure they will like that positive feedback. Thank you.

David: Ben, all yours.

Ben: The office itself here has been very busy in support of the Board activities, Board communications, just general administration, which includes financial management, which by the way with COVID, took a giant shift. It all became digital. With a one-person office, it took up a lot more time.

Just general communications with the outside world, the office is closed here, but we are still open for appointments. We were limited for our school tours, extremely limited for them, but there are individuals who come in and out. They are either giving us phone calls or talking to us through email, or they are coming in and just having general discussions off the street.

Also, of course, the website is always looking to improve and update. Our archive and library system was continually updated. We are acquiring new material all the time and moving forward with our archive research as time goes on.

Of course, there is support for the Research Program and the regulatory support as well with Paul. A couple of things with that is support also for the education module piece GMOB offered two years ago to be able to provide some specialized contracting to be able to help with that. We have just completed that, and it is in GNWT's hands right now for distribution. I look forward to seeing that really move forward quite quickly.

Then there is support for the upcoming GMOB initiatives. That includes strategy, for the archive strategy for communications, and of course a community survey which

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

will be done here probably in the fall. It will involve communications with everybody to make that the best possible survey that we can for the period of time. Otherwise, it has been busy here. There is a lot going on.

David: Thanks, Ben. Are there any questions of any of the Board members from folks?

Chris: I just wanted to say congrats on the funding arrangement with NSERC. That's great news.

David: Yeah, it is very good news.

Reconciliation Issues and Actions

David: Alright, the next issue is reconciliation issues and actions. I am not entirely clear, I must admit, what was expected here, maybe a brief roundtable. I would point out that while we are encouraged by the ongoing discussions with the Yellowknives by Canada, we sure hope that those come to a successful conclusion sooner rather than later. It has definitely been a long work in progress. I think everybody would welcome an end to that.

I will just throw it open. I don't know if anybody has any particular initiatives that they have got underway that directly address reconciliation issues. By and large, I think everything we do related to the Project ultimately is an effort towards reconciliation with the Indigenous folks who are so affected by the Project itself. Are there any comments?

Natalie: Sure, I guess I can provide an update on two fronts that our department is working on. One is the apology and compensation, which has been a recommendation by GMOB. As the Project knows, it is always much bigger than the Project. Our Minister is working with the Yellowknives. As much as last week, they had a workshop. I think it was last Wednesday evening. I can't remember the exact date. They are working on a protocol agreement on how the negotiations will go forward.

So, there has been some good progress. I can't presuppose how it will conclude. That is certainly at the Minister and the Chief level, but they are working on it, and they do have a protocol agreement. That is some great progress on the apology and compensation front.

The side that the Project can work on is the community benefits, plan, or agreement. I'm not sure what we are going to call it, but we are in negotiations right now. I can't speak to it, but we are negotiating an agreement with the Yellowknives.

David: Great. Thank you. Anybody else? William or Jess?

GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties

May 17, 2021

William: One of the initiatives that has been on my mind for a while is having a site blessing prior to shovels going into the ground, to get membership onsite and maybe do a feed-the-fire ceremony mixed with a blessing. The remediation is starting, and it is very important to our people, and so I think the community would really appreciate having a site blessing right from the start of the remediation.

Natalie: We can work on that, William. Yeah, let's get on it. We have a couple of months.

William: Sounds good.

David: That is a really nice idea. Jess, is there anything from the North Slave Métis on this topic?

Jess H: No, not really anything at this time. Thank you, though.

David: Okay. Alright. Unless anybody has anything to add on that topic...

Alex: David, if I could just add something. We mentioned this last year. I just wanted to mention it again, because the Project feels it is an important one. The Hoèła weteèts'eèdè Study is really centered around the YKDFN. One of the things this year the Project provided is some additional funding for the YKDFN for their Wellness Department to hire the necessary nurses and counselors to support their members that participate in this study. We think this work is really a step in the right direction for reconciliation.

Additionally, I think the offsite risk assessment is an important piece that has been missing for some time in this discussion. It allows community members and Indigenous communities that were most impacted by this Project to have the appropriate or the necessary information to make informed decisions about land use. We are looking forward for that work to be engaged on.

David: Great. Thank you very much. Is there anybody else? Any last comments on this topic?

Jeff: I guess I could add a comment. It is very good to see that the Project is addressing reconciliation being that I am a member of the Yellowknives Dene First Nation, just getting an opportunity to be a part of this Project Team. As William said earlier, we are working on this Traditional Knowledge brochure. That will go a long way to provide an overview of the local history of the area of Yellowknife Bay. Mahsi Cho for everything.

**GMRPEA Semi-Annual Meeting of the Parties
May 17, 2021**

Additional Agenda Items, Next Meeting, and Next Steps

David: Thanks very much. That is an interesting observation. Thank you. Okay, so I think that is it unless anybody else has any final comments. Are there any additional agenda items? I think we have gone through quite a few as it is.

Okay, next meeting and next steps: I guess the next meeting will be in the fall, hopefully an in-person meeting. We shall see. Everybody go and get your vaccinations, please, if you have not already.

Next steps: I think we will produce a transcript of this meeting. We have all the meetings that are scheduled, so we will be seeing one another virtually or in person from time to time over the next continuous months. Here's hoping that spring is actually here, and we can get out on the lake and on the land to enjoy the better weather that is coming. Thanks, everyone. Thank you for your participation, and we are actually breaking up early. That's something. Bye for now.

Meeting Adjourned



November 30, 2021

David Livingstone
Chair
Giant Mine Oversight Board

Date

Motions

Motion: Moved: T. Slack moved to approve the agenda.
Seconded: G. Hamre
Motion carried.

Motion: Moved: K. Racher moved to accept the Semi-Annual Meeting Minutes of December 16, 2020.
Seconded: M. Nabert
Motion carried.